

CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)  
ADDENDUM 7

## FELONY/MISDEMEANOR SCRIPT

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
1	1		<b>It is our understanding to enter the charges for defendant Smith in this step as identified in Event 3 as listed for defendant Daley (except the charges listed as “additional for Joe Daley”). (Please advise if this is NOT correct)</b>
			Yes, it is not correct. In Event 3 remove charge Felony 23153 (a) from Joe Daley and add it to Jane Smith.
2	2	4.4.2 6.1.1	<b>Generate minute order forms. Display on minute order, the record of appearances. Please clarify whether the script is asking for a minute order to be generated and then a clerk notes the appearances, or if the appearances should be printed on the generated minute order form before the hearing begins?</b>
			Generate the minute order form before hearing begins for the clerk to note the appearances.
3	3		<b>Need to clarify which charges belong to which Defendant. Top of page 3 states “Enter the following information for Joe Daley”, with the charges displayed. After the first set of charges states “Enter the following additional violation information for Joe Daley”. It is not clear if Joe Daley also violated the original charges. Both defendants would not be charged with VC 23153(a).</b>
			See response to question # 1.
4	4	1.3.1	<b>Display calculation of bail amount. As Jane Smith is a co-defendant and in custody, associate Daley’s warrant request to Jane Smith’s record. Please clarify whether we are to associate one warrant to two defendants or issue two warrants (one for each defendant).</b>
			One warrant to two defendants, the warrant is for one defendant only
5	4	1.3.1	<b>Why is the Warrant being associated with both parties as it is only being issued against one Defendant. The parties are already associated, but the Warrant only applies one Defendant.</b>
			The association is for information and display purposes only.
6	4	1.3.1	<b>If the warrant were being issued for defendant 2, why would this be associated with the other defendant?</b>
			See response to questions 4 and 5.
7	4	1.4.2	<b>A bail amount of 30,000 was set by the Judge. Please clarify what bail we are to calculate in this step.</b>
			No. There are no calculations necessary. Delete 1.4.2 (c) for Felony/Misdemeanor case type only.
8	4	1.4.2	<b>Bail amounts would not be calculated pursuant to PC1463 or Rule 4.102 (Rule 850 renumbered to 4.102 in 2001) at this point, as this section relates to the distribution of monies, and no monies have</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>been received, and no fines imposed.</b>
			See response to question 7.
9	6	1.3.2	<b>The Amended Complaint is only as to defendant Jane June-Smith, but the associated requirement relates to associating the filing of a single document to multiple parties.</b>
			The association is for information and display purposes only.
10	6	1.3.2	<b>If the document were being filed on 1st defendant to change name, why would this be associated on the 2nd defendant?</b>
			The association is for information and display purposes only.
11	6	2.3.1	<b>Display the case index. What elements are expected to be displayed in the case index?</b>
			Display all names per A and B in the case index.
12	7	4.1.1	<b>The first portion of this Case Event indicates that the judge is not available on 7/10/01 due to a private appointment, but when the operator overrides based on the Judge calling and stating he is available, a warning is returned stating that the courtroom is full. If the judge was not available, how is the courtroom full? Is the judge holding court in the same courtroom with another judge?</b>
			One courtroom can have many judges.
13	7	4.1.1 (c)	<b>The Operator receives a warning that the courtroom is full on 7/10/01, and does not have the security level to override. The supervisor then overrides, but the event is scheduled for 7/17/01. The arraignment is then held on 7/10/2001. The date of 7/17/2001 appears to be an error.</b>
			See Addendum 6.
14	9	2.3.1	<b>Enable data entry of: True name. Please clarify what is meant by True Name. Must this be a separate field in the database?</b>
			It is a court determined official 'true name.' It need not be a separate field.
15	11	1.3.3 1.4.1	<b>No previous case information was provided for either of the cases indicated in Case Scenarios 2 or 3. Please provide charges and other information to be entered.</b>
			Provider can choose charges and other case information as necessary.
16	11	1.3.3 1.4.1	<b>Defendant Sam Waters. Defendant James Johnson Should these defendants be associated to the June-Smith case or are these two new cases? If these are two new cases can they be set up prior to the certification demonstration (in order to avoid initiation of the cases during the demonstration...)?</b>
			No, the defendants need not be associated to the June-Smith case. Yes, they are two new cases. Yes, they can be set up prior to certification.
17	11	1.4.1	<b>This functional requirement does not apply as bail monies are being posted, not attorney's fees, jury, report, electronic recording, or witness fees. Also, these deposits would not apply in a criminal</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>case.</b>
			Addendum 1 addressed question. It is not required Criminal case types.
<b>18</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.4.1</b>	<b>Track attorney fees, jury fees, etc. Is it required for Criminal case types?</b>
			Addendum 1 addressed question. It is not required Criminal case types.
<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7.2.4(b)</b>	<b>The functional requirement does not require the type of payment plan / schedule as shown in the task, only that the application allows distribution to multiple cases either equally, consecutively or by select amount. The requirement also does not require that all three methods be applied at the same time, as one would contradict the others.</b>
			Process the payments as listed in the requirement, they need not be applied at the same time.
<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>		<p><b>Court required the June-Smith's payments to be distributed as follows:</b>  <b>1st priority. \$100 goes toward the installment for the DUI fine; 2nd: Any amount above that up to \$100 should be prorated equally for the two</b>  <b>finest until the 11357(b) fine is paid in full. 3rd: Any amount above that up to \$50, should be first distributed equally between this case and the first 2000 case;</b>  <b>4th: Any amount between \$50 and \$75 distributed consecutively between this case and the 1999 case; and 5th: \$50 each for this case and the second 2000 case.</b></p> <p><b>Defendant Smith pays her 1<sup>st</sup> installment of \$100 and an additional \$ 550.</b>  <b>A payment of \$650 is made.</b></p> <p><b>The 1st directive is clear. The first \$100 to the DUI fine. (\$550 remains)</b></p> <p><b>The 2nd directive is unclear. What is to be pro-rated (the payments or the fines)? In this event, we are receiving \$650, so we have a full \$100 to use in this directive. Pro-rated may be interpreted as "equally" paying off the two fines (in which case they will be paid off at the same time) or "equally" splitting the \$100 (which will result in the 11357 being paid off after two payments where there is "\$100 over \$100" paid) (\$450 remains)</b></p> <p><b>The 3rd is relatively clear. The next \$50 gets distributed -- \$25 to the DUI and \$25 to the 1st 2000 case. (\$400 remains)</b>  <b>Strike "Any amount above that,"</b></p> <p><b>The 4th is unclear. Do we assume "between \$50 and \$75" means "the next \$25" which would mean \$12.50 to this case and \$12.50 to</b></p>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<p><b>the 1999 case? (\$375 remains)</b></p> <p><b>The 5th is unclear. Is this the "next \$100?" (split would be \$50 for this case and \$50 for the second 2000 case) (\$275 remains)</b></p> <p><b>If the above is true.....\$100 + \$100 + 50 + 25 + 100 = \$375. What do we do with the remaining \$275? (\$650 - \$375)</b></p> <p><b>Develop the 2000 case with a balance</b></p>
			<p>Please replace use the following: Defendant Smith pays her 1st payment of \$100 and an additional \$550 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* First, \$100 to current case (DUI and HS11357(b) fines)</li> <li>* Second, \$100 split equally between 1999 case and current case</li> <li>* Third, \$175 paid by select amounts, \$75 to 1999 case and \$100 to current case</li> <li>* Fourth, \$300 paid consecutively, first to 1999 case until paid off, then the remainder to the current case.</li> </ul> <p>Providers will need to be told to create the 1999 case with any violation, and dispose of it by imposing a fine of \$250.00.</p> <p>See attached MS Excel spreadsheet (Felmisevnt_15_724.xls) for additional information.</p> <p>The first sheet (Sample Fines) shows sample of a \$2000 DUI fine and a \$100 HS11357(b) fine. Note that the 2% automation fee and County/State splits are not shown. Some systems do these calculations at the end of day or end of month. See the third sheet (Alternate Distributions) for distributions including these amounts.</p> <p>The second sheet (Payment Scenarios) shows four payments demonstrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Priority/Proration within a single case</li> <li>* Payment applied equally between fines on two different cases</li> <li>* Payment applied to fines on two different cases using select amounts</li> <li>* Payment applied to fines on two different cases consecutively, paying the first off then applying the remainder to the second case</li> </ul>
<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7.2.4</b>	<p><b>The script makes reference to old cases from 2000 and 1999 for a particular defendant. Reference to these cases only appears in this section. Should we initiate old cases for this party? And if so, what fees should be associated so that the function is demonstrated?</b></p>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			Yes, you need to have developed 1999 and 2000 cases with X and Y fines in them
22	15	7.2.4	<b>Script indicates that the defendant, June Smith needs to pay a fine and that it needs to be distributed between this case and the 1999 case and the second 2000 case. These cases are not referred to prior to the payment. What should the cases be?</b>
			See response to questions 20 and 21.
23	15		<b>The Case Event has money being applied to three previous cases, but script data was never provided for these previous cases.</b>
			See response to questions 20 and 21.
24	15		<b>The Case Event states that certain documents are ordered confidential and sealed, but there is not a task, outcome or functional requirement shown.</b>
			It is just being set up here to be demonstrated later.
25	16		<b>The Case Event states “Preliminary hearing as to Defendant Dough trial” -- until the preliminary hearing is complete it will not be determined if there is enough evidence to hold a trial, and I am unclear as to why the trial is mentioned here.</b>
			The amount of evidence is not relevant for this evaluation, this script is only for evaluation purposes.
26	16	6.2.2	<b>Track data elements for: D. Attorney (singular). Script shows multiple attorneys submitting exhibits, should we track more than one attorney?</b>
			Need not be more than one attorney on one exhibit.
27	18	5.1.9	<b>The last task states “Enter paper warrant information”. If the Warrant has not yet been returned, what is being entered? The task should be to display all warrants that have been executed/served/recalled but not yet returned.</b>
			The task should be to “track paper warrant info.
28	20	5.1.9	<b>If the Defendant appears, the Warrant is “Quashed”, not “Released”.</b>
			Technically you are correct, quashed or released will be acceptable.
29	21	1.4.3	<b>The bond has been placed in a forfeited state only, and there is no money to distribute at this time, but one of the tasks and the related functional requirement is to “Distribute bail amounts across fund accounts....” Also Rule 850 referred to in the functional requirement has been renumbered to 4.102</b>
			1.4.3 (c) does not apply for Felony/Misdemeanor case types.
30	25	7.2.8	<b>The beginning of the Case Event related to this requirement states “Defendant Dough meets Lucy Lou Daley at the counter and she says that she paid Defendant June-Smith’s fine in full”. This is based on the previous \$100 payment. When Defendant June-Smith was sentenced, she received fines of \$2000 and \$100, so this should not have paid the fine in full (more than \$1,000 is still owed). If this is just referring the \$100 fine for the HS violation, based on the</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>previously defined allocations of money, a portion of this fine was already paid when the Defendant paid the \$650 previously based on the allocation rules.</b>
			See response to question 20.
<b>31</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7.2.8</b>	<b>At the end of the Case Event related to this requirement states “Operator Susie Roberts voids the transaction and collects fine at Terminal 21 at Modesto Branch” – the fine was voided due to being paid twice, and no additional fine monies are being collected, so it is unclear as to what fine is being collected. Also, the money would never simply be voided, especially the next day – instead, it would be transferred into a refund account and a refund sent.</b>
			No additional fine needs to be collected. It is up to each court/provider to determine how the void transaction is processed, based on accounting principles/policies.
<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.4.6</b>	<b>Operator selects and sends notice to party Debbie Ruhl stating that the writ fee transaction has been voided. Please clarify this paragraph. (<i>Debbie Ruhl is not a party to this case</i>) Should we notice Lucy Lou Daley and reference the \$50.00 fine she paid for Jane Smith? As an aside, our clients have indicated that writ fees are normally not a part of criminal cases.</b>
			Use Lucy Lou Daley as the recipient of the notice. Writ fee requirement is not to be demonstrated for Criminal module.
<b>33</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.4.6</b>	<b>Script indicates that 'Using the criteria for timing of within one day of a voided transaction, operator selects and sends notice to party Debbie Ruhl stating that the writ fee transaction has been voided.' Who is Debbie Ruhl and was there ever a writ fee taken?</b>
			See response to question 32.
<b>34</b>	<b>26</b>		<b>Debbie Ruhl is not a party on the June-Smith case. Should we add her as a party or who should the notice be sent to?</b>
			See response to question 32.
<b>35</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2.2.7</b>	<b>Charges are reduced from Felony to Misdemeanor. Change case type (e.g., from Felony to Misdemeanor). Please clarify whether we should change the case type, change the violation, or change both to demonstrate the functionality.</b>
			2.2.7 not applicable for Criminal module.
<b>36</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7.2.3</b>	<b>In Case Event 11, these two defendants posted bail, but no further activity has occurred, so bail was never forfeited and a Summary Judgment date was never set.</b>
			Please forfeit the bail amount and process the case to result in a Summary Judgment as necessary.
<b>37</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7.2.3</b>	<b>This has original bail of \$15,000. Are we to assume charges (amount owing) on case for \$15,000? Bail reduced to \$10,000.</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>\$5,000.00 applied as payment. Are we to refund \$10,000 to defendant? This would leave \$5,000.00 amount owing on the case. Is this the correct interpretation?</b>
			\$5000 is exonerated, not applied. \$10000 remains as bond amount. No amount is being refunded.
<b>38</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7.2.3</b>	<b>Case Scenario 2: The beginning of the Case Event relating to Sam Waters states that "...\$5,000 is applied as payment for the case." There was not a task disposing of the case, finding the defendant guilty, or assessing a fine; therefore, there are no outstanding amounts on the case to which the bail can be applied.</b>
			See response to question 37.
<b>39</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2.1.2</b>	<b>This date should be 9/4/01 instead of 9/IV/01?? Or are we to validate the roman numeral is not valid? (Our system will not allow alpha field to be entered in an alpha field)</b>
			Yes, not allowing alpha field entries is acceptable.
<b>40</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2.2.2</b>	<b>The related task states "Enter overdue status of proof of Defendant June-Smith's attendance at AA meeting". This does not match the functional requirement, which requires that these cases be identified and displayed. Since the event is overdue, and nothing has been received, the task should just be to view the overdue event as there is nothing additional to enter, and viewing was already covered in the previous event.</b>
			The system needs to recognize the status, you need not enter the information.
<b>41</b>	<b>29</b>		<b>Is this related to event 26 as opposed to event 13 as stated? Our system will add the NSF fee at the time the check is returned and the payment reversed/removed. (in Event 26) Will this be acceptable?</b>
			That is a typographical error, the event relates to 26. Yes, that is acceptable.
<b>42</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2.3.8</b>	<b>In Event 15 (07-24-01), the Defendant is sentenced and ordered to show proof 60 days from the date, however in Event 29 the date is 09-05-01 and we are supposed to show that it is overdue. Technically it is not overdue until 09-24-01. How best do we show that the event is overdue? Since Event 30 is dated 12-11-01, can we change the Event 29 date to 09-24-01?</b>
			Yes, change the date to 09-25-01.
<b>43</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2.3.2</b>	<b>Script indicates that the deft. June Smith is arrested for 457(a) PC, this is not a valid charge. Should the charge be 475(a) PC (Possessing Forged Paper)?</b>
			Yes. Any valid charge will be acceptable.
<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2.3.2</b>	<b>Operator later realizes that the defendant is in violation of probation of the original case and adds the appropriate data into</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>the case record. Please clarify whether there is a task or expected outcome we should perform relating to this paragraph.</b>
			There is no task or expected outcome for that note.
<b>45</b>	<b>Misc</b>	<b>2.2.5</b>	<b>Coordination of cases is not a Felony/Misdemeanor requirement.</b>
			See Addendum 1. It is applicable.
<b>46</b>	<b>Misc</b>	<b>2.2.8</b>	<b>Bifurcation of cases is not a Felony/Misdemeanor requirement.</b>
			See Addendum 1. This requirement has been deleted.
<b>47</b>	<b>Misc-</b>	<b>7.1.3</b>	<b>Display for fees &amp; fines the application's algorithms use of absolute values, relative values, fixed dollars, percentages, prorations, and any combination of the above. Please clarify what is meant by "absolute values".</b>
			"Absolute number and fixed dollars are the same.
<b>48</b>	<b>Misc-</b>	<b>7.1.4</b>	<b>Allow for distribution formulas to be predicated upon factors like: B. Enhancement; C. Special; assessments. Our assumption is that enhancement factors, refer to "priors" and special assessments refer to factors such as the violation of not wearing a seat belt. If not could you provide an example of an enhancement factor?</b>
			Example, a pleading ticket when they have a prior, \$10 to the base fine is added.
<b>49</b>	<b>Misc</b>	<b>7.3.2</b>	<b>This should be clarified as to whether this report is for an individual case or period of time – if for an individual case, Operator Totals and Cash Drawer Totals should not be included.</b>
			See Addendum 3.
<b>50</b>	<b>Misc-</b>	<b>7.3.4</b>	<b>Track: C. Generate write-off payment reports. Does the report refer to listing the cases and amounts for cases that have already been written off or does it refer to identifying, listing the cases, and amounts that need to be written off? Can you provide an example of a criminal write-off?</b>
			The report should refer to amounts to be written off. Example would be an uncollectable fine, based on each court's policy.
<b>51</b>	<b>Misc</b>	<b>7.3.5(b) and (c)</b>	<b>Jury and Reporter Fees do not apply in Criminal cases. The tasks and expected outcome both include references to these types of deposits.</b>
			Yes that is correct, they are not applicable.

## **TRAFFIC SCRIPT**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
<b>1</b>	<b>All</b>		<b>Addendum 6 does not clear up the date issues in this script for Sunny Howard. Please review all the dates through out this case</b>



**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>and the timing of the events.</b>
			Please adjust and use dates accordingly, to suit the case events.
<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>In Case Event #1 it lists Sunny Howard's Driver's License # as I2640123 but in Case Event #3 it is listed as N2640123. Which is the correct one to use?</b>
			Use either one, but continue to use one DL# consistently throughout the evaluation.
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>DL on warrant different than entered in Event 1. Typo or Correction? Need to change DL from I2640123 to N2640123?</b>
			See response to question 2.
<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>In Case Event #2 we set a pre-trial hearing for 7/2/01 but the court trial is scheduled for 6/15/01. We previously questioned the AOC as to how you can have a court trial before the pre-trial hearing. In the Addendum the AOC issued, it was stated that this was an oversight and that the trial date should be set for 7/15/01. However, this date does not work with the rest of the script and we found that our system requires that we vacate the pre-trial hearing before allowing us to schedule the 6/15/01 court trial, so the script works as originally scripted. – Is there any problem if we go back to using the script as it was originally written?</b>
			Please adjust and use dates accordingly, to suit the case events.
<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.4.2</b>	<b>Only bail has been posted at this point. There is not a conviction, and therefore the monies would only be deposited in a trust account, not distributed across fund accounts.</b>
			It can be done at this point or later at conviction, or as a fine is imposed or taken.
<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.4.2</b>	<b>This posts a cash bail <u>and</u> a bond. Is the bail actual cash and the bond a surety bond?</b>
			Yes.
<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.4.9</b>	<b>Based on the State Bail Schedule, we know that the Bail Amount is \$135, but the amount to be posted for in Cash Bail and a Bond should be provided, as this is necessary for Case Event 13. These amounts could be assumed, but it would be helpful if they were provided to ensure that there are monies left to pay to accommodate future Case Events.</b>
			Use whatever amounts necessary to arrive at a \$200 balance.
<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.4.9</b>	<b>Using bail schedule and associating it with charge tables, calculate and distribute bail amounts...Because monies have not been receipted at this point should this step come after the next step 1.4.2? It seems to be out of sequence.</b>
			It can be demonstrated either way.
<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>The Case Event states “The sheriff ran the defendant’s name, found the warrant was outstanding and placed the case for calendar”. The sheriff would never place a case on calendar. This is also the first time the Defendant has not appeared, and the warrant would just now be issued; therefore, at this time there</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>would not be anything for the sheriff to find.</b>
			Delete " The sheriff ...calendar," from the script.
<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>Clerk searches by ticket # 415559, which is suppose to be correct. #1 says it originally is 41559. Can you please review. It seems like Event 11 may be reversed. Are we changing a number erroneously entered here or just entering the wrong number when trying to find the case by the ticket number? 2.2.6.what error are we reversing here?</b>
			The ticket number was entered incorrectly and the error needs to be reversed.
<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>Our CMS will not allow hearing to be assigned to another judge without a "change judge" event. In other words, it's practically not possible to accidentally assign the wrong judge to a hearing. Will this be in compliance?</b>
			That will be acceptable, however a warning is necessary.
<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7.2.3</b>	<b>The amount of the fine needs to be specified to determine how to apply the bail amounts. A later Case Event has an additional \$200 payment being made, which means that the judge had to impose a much larger than normal fine. Therefore, it would be very helpful to the vendors to have the amounts specified.</b>
			See response to questions 7 and 8.
<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>		<b>The Case Event shows that financial statements and evaluations are to be deemed confidential and sealed, but there is not a related task. Also, this portion of the Case Event would NEVER happen in a traffic case, and should not be included here. Case Event 20 also references these documents.</b>
			This is for informational purposes only and is being set up to be demonstrated later.
<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2.2.9</b>	<b>The filing of an Appeal after Case Disposition does not automatically suspend the case or remove it from the Court's control, especially in a traffic case since the same court processes the appeal.</b>
			Add sentence "Fine is stayed."
<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>		<b>The end of the Case Event states "Operator decides not to accept payment and enter information." In a traffic case, the Defendant must request that the case be stayed; otherwise, the Court MUST accept the monies, and this would not be at the discretion of the Operator. A Case Event should be added stating that the Defendant requested that the case be stayed.</b>
			See response to question 14.
<b>16</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>2.5.1</b>	<b>The last Task in this Case Event refers to "See case event 15". Case Event 15 is not related to this case in any way. Should this be Case Event 18? Also, why is this hold under the name "Mercedes Isabel Martinez" if it was issued in the case that had the name "Mercedes Inajosa Martinez". The system uses the name on the case to place the</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			<b>warrant &amp; hold and the script is asking that we force the system to make an error and that should not be possible.</b>
			Yes, it should be case event 18. Issue and hold warrant under Mercedes Inajosa Martinez. See event 18. Operator realizes warrant was issued in error on a wrong case, please use a different case to demonstrate this requirement.
17	17	2.5.1	<b>Retrieve hold information. (Note: this hold will be under the name of Mercedes Isabel Martinez. See case event 15) There does not seem to be a relationship between case 15 and case 17 for Mercedes I. Martinez. Should the “note” be disregarded?</b>
			See response to question 16.
18	17/18		<b>Case Event 17 states that the Warrant is held and the hearing is continued until 8/21/01. Three days from the Held Date would be 8/20/01, so one of these days is incorrect. In Case Event 18, which is on 8/20/01, states that the Defendant failed to appear, but the hearing was not scheduled until 8/21/01, which is the date the Defendant was to appear.</b>
			Hold warrant for two days and schedule for 8/20/01.
19	19	5.1.1	<b>The Case Event states that the Defendant pays for the interpreter fee – defendants in criminal cases cannot be charged for interpreters. Also, the Case Event does not match the actual requirement, which is to track interpreters.</b>
			No fee required, however, interpreters need to be tracked.
20	19	5.1.1	<b>Mercedes requests a Creole language interpreter and pays a \$130.00. Should the interpreter fee be receipted? The script does not indicate that a payment should be taken.</b>
			See response to question 19.
21	25	7.3.6	<b>Display status of accounts referred for collection. What specifically is meant by “status” of accounts?</b>
			Status – referred for collection.
22	Misc	4.2.3	<b>The task specifies that time slots and schedules should be modified for “courtroom clerks”, which is not a part of the requirement.</b>
			That’s correct, it is not for courtroom clerks.

## **JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SCRIPT**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
1	1	2.3.8	<b>What is the definition of a party status of “New”, and why is it necessary in a Juvenile case.</b>

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
			Display party status, use your discretion.
2	6  21	5.1.9  5.1.9	<b>Minor appears in custody with attorney Williams. Warrant returned to court as served and released. There seems to be a conflict between case event 6 and case event 21. Case 6 indicates the warrant is served and released. Case event 21 indicates the same warrant should have a status of not returned. Please clarify.</b>
			Change “returned” to “recalled” in case event. In event 21 the physical paper warrant is being returned.
3	7		<b>What is a “Dennis H.” hearing – maybe a “Detention” hearing? Also, this was previously referred to as an “Arraignment”, which does not apply in Juvenile.</b>
			For more information see 19 C. A. 3d 350: 96 Cal. Rptr. 791.
4	11		<b>The last portion of this Case Event indicates that the Operator tracks the warrant and adds an entry that the paper warrant had not been returned. There are three problems with this. First, the Warrant was returned on 7/10/2001 (Case Event 6). Second, an entry would not be made showing that it had not been returned – the fact that the return has not been entered indicates that it was not returned. Third, there is no associated Task for this portion of the Case Event (although there really should not be anyway, which makes the Case Event confusing)</b>
			See above. In case event 6 the warrant gets recalled. Delete “ Operator tracks ...returned for filing.”
5	11	1.4.6	<b>Enter relevant information to issue notices regarding the fine payment, based on the criteria set for the timing of the notices. What date is this notice expected to be issued? Is it immediately or by some future date?</b>
			Criteria is dependent on each court, can be one day later or few days later.
6	11	4.1.3	<b>Generate notices and forms per Education Code 825 and send to school district. Our research has indicated the reference to Education Code 825 is actually Welfare &amp; Institutions code 827 (which <i>indicates a notice must be sent to the school when a minor has been found to have committed a felony or misdemeanor offense.</i>) Is this correct?</b>
			It is the WIC 827. Also see MS Word attachments (Educode1 and Educode_notice)
7	13		<b>In “rebalancing” the account, does that mean adjusting the payments over the remaining months? Or consider her a month ahead? Or still require a payment the following month and will pay off a month early?</b>
			Yes, it is adjusting over the remaining months.

**CMS FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS (2002)**  
**ADDENDUM 7**

#	Case Event	Functional Requirement	Issue
8	20	7.3.7	An operator would never return the unclaimed monies. Where did she get the money -- out of her receipts for the day? To have the vendor meet the requirement, the Case Event should be changed to some type of batch process at an administrator level.
			Replace sentence "Operator processes return of \$45 to Johnson."